

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 have been examined and are all the claims pending in the application.

***Formal matters***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for reviewing and initialing the documents in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on May 1, 2006.

***Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-3, 10-12, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kuwazoe, which is already of record.

Claim 1 has been amended, and recites the feature wherein the control means exercises control to assign priorities to the plurality of functions separately for each of said main and auxiliary display means. The Examiner maintains that this feature is disclosed by Kuwazoe at paragraphs 13, 14, and 34-48. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

As an initial matter, the Examiner appears to be interpreting the term "functions" inconsistently between claim 1 and claim 2 which depends from claim 1. At page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner interprets the *accessing and displaying* of information as the claimed functions. However, in the Response to Arguments section of the same Final Office Action, the Examiner equates the *information items* being displayed as the claimed functions.

Assuming the Examiner's first meaning of term functions as being accessing and displaying, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kuwazoe does not disclose or otherwise teach assigning priorities to the assigning and displaying. Paragraphs 13 and 14 disclose that a user-

selected information item will have a “high priority” to the user, by nature of its selection, and will thus always be displayed on the sub display device. Moreover, these paragraphs discuss an “information item with high priority” and “priority of information”. However, this does not equate to assigning a priority to *displaying* and *accessing* the information, as set forth by the claim under this interpretation of the term “functions”. Paragraphs 34-48 contain similar description. For example, paragraph 48 describes “priority of information” also.

Assuming the Examiner’s second meaning of the term functions as being the information items themselves, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kuwazoe still does not disclose or otherwise teach the claimed feature. While Kuwazoe does appear to teach a hierarchy of information items, the hierarchy is *predetermined*, and thus not assigned, as set forth by the claim. See, e.g., paragraph 34.

Moreover, under either interpretation, Kuwazoe does not disclose that the control means assigns priorities separately for each of the main and auxiliary displays. At paragraph 13, Kuwazoe describes that an item of high priority is always displayed on the sub display. However, there is no disclosure that the control means assigns a higher priority to the item. Rather, it is the user who has prioritized the item. That is, the user selects an item, which is then always displayed on the sub display. Paragraph 47 similarly discloses that the item is displayed until a user selects another item.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Kuwazoe.

Independent claims 10 and 19 have been amended similarly to claim 1, and thus recite similar features to those discussed above, and therefore, claims 10 and 19 are patentable for the same reasons. The remaining claims are patentable based on their dependencies.

***Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 4-9, 13-18, and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kuwazoe in view of Hama. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 4-9, 13-18, and 22-27 each depend from one of independent claims 1, 10, or 19, each of which have been shown above to be patentable over Kuwazoe. Hama does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Kuwazoe. Therefore, claims 4-9, 13-18, and 22-27 are patentable over the Kuwazoe and Hama combination.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

*Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.114(c)*  
*U.S. Appln No. 10/803,942*

*Q80531*

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf  
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 17, 2006